DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 727 HE 019 212

AUTHOR Zirkel, Perry A.
TITLE Faculty Bargaining and Campus Governance: Rhetoric v. Research.
INSTITUTION American Association of Univ. Administrators, Washington, D.C.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 86
CONTRACT 400-82-0011
NOTE 7p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of University Administrators, P.O. Box 6221, University, AL 35486 ($2.00).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071) -- Viewpoints (120)
JOURNAL CIT Administrator's Update; v6 n2 1986

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Centralization; *Collective Bargaining; College Administration; *College Faculty; *Governance; Higher Education; Organizational Climate; *Participative Decision Making; *Power Structure; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Unions

ABSTRACT

The body of rhetorical writing and research studies about the interrelationship of faculty bargaining and campus governance are compared and synthesized. The research is emphasized so that the findings can inform and advance the ongoing debate and operational decision about this issue. Qualified, but not complete, support is found for the belief that lack of faculty influence in institutional decision-making causes faculty unionization. Other significant variables, such as the institutional context, enter into this equation. The view that faculty bargaining causes significant increase in the faculty's influence in institutional decision-making is not clearly supported, particularly for academic matters at mature universities. The notion that faculty bargaining will bring about the end of faculty senates is premature. The literature supports the assertion that other collegial governance structures, such as personnel and academic committees, will be either significantly eroded or enhanced. Finally, to the extent that faculty have collectively gained influence in decision-making, it seems that their gains have been generally paralleled by centralization of administrative authority, largely at the expense of deans and department chairs. A 59-item reference list is included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy

ED267727

1986
Volume 6
Number 2

Administrator's Update

American Association of University Administrators

Clearinghouse on Higher Education

Faculty Bargaining and Campus Governance: Rhetoric v. Research

Perry A. Zirkel*

The growth of faculty bargaining has largely been a phenomenon of the 1970s. In the early 1980s, the proportion of higher education faculty covered by collective bargaining contracts leveled off, at least temporarily, at approximately 20 to 25 percent—slightly higher than the proportion in the rest of the nation's work force (Garbarino 1980; National Center 1982).

Although the literature about the interrelationship of faculty bargaining and campus governance is extensive, much of the widely disseminated writing consists of strongly subjective and value-laden rhetoric. ("Campus governance" is treated here in terms of the decision-making structure within an institution, with a focus on the faculty's influence on it.) Substantial research on the topic has been relatively neglected. Consequently, "the impact of faculty collective bargaining on the governance of higher education . . . is a subject on which much has been written, [but] it remains shrouded in folklore and mythology" (Crossland 1976, p. 41).

This article provides an overview of the rhetoric and the research concerning the interrelationship of faculty bargaining and campus governance. It emphasizes the research, so that the findings can inform and advance the ongoing debate and operational decisions about this important issue.

HE 019 212

Rhetoric

The rhetorical writing about faculty bargaining and its relationship with campus governance seems to be derived from and divisible into two opposing assumptions. One view is that faculty bargaining enforces and enhances shared authority (see, for example, Brophy 1972). This view, typical of but not limited to faculty union advocates, describes collective bargaining as democratic as well as professional (Change 1977) and decries collegiality as largely mythical or historical (Baldridge 1982). The opposing view is that faculty unionization is "destructive of the traditional role of the faculty in the decision-making process of the university [and] ... will at least militate against any increased role for the faculty in governance" (Hanley 1971, p. 12). From this perspective, held by some but far from all institutional authorities, collective bargaining is "rife with negative possibilities" (Ianni 1974, p. 295), including losses in the faculty's professionalism, educational quality, and senate authority (Meskill and Meskill 1976). A trade-off may be the result: "The employee-professor in the new world may turn out to be a better paid individual in a spiritually poorer environment" (Boyd 1971, p. 314).

Despite these polarized perspectives, both sides seem to concur on certain points. First, adherents of each viewpoint have characterized the causal relationship between faculty bargaining and campus governance as neither one way nor isolated. Thus, although disagreeing on the degree and direction of this relationship, both sides have portrayed faculty participation in campus governance as having an effect on as well as being an effect of faculty participation in collective bargaining (Boyd 1971; Shanker 1978). Similarly, concomitant and contextual factors are perceived as playing significant roles in the cause-effect relationship (Carey 1978; Duggan 1980).

The specific issue of the effect of faculty bargaining on faculty senates has been the subject of controversy rather than consensus. Based on limited experience, sometimes not extending beyond one institution, some participants have portrayed the coexistence of faculty unions and senates as unsatisfactory (Dougherty 1977), while others have portrayed it as favorable (Wardwell 1979). Predicting a likely diminution in the role of senates, Garbarino and Aussieker (1975) portrayed three possible effects: cooperation, competition, and cooptation. To foster accommodation and cooperation and to avoid absorption or cooptation of senates, several observers have posited the

effectiveness of adaptations of the industrial paradigm—for example, dual-track, two-tiered, or integrative models of collective bargaining (Birnbaum 1980; Lavine and Lemon 1975). These various formulations aim at structurally and functionally separating the spheres of authority of unions and senates. Beyond these formulations, opinion is significantly split as to whether senates and other faculty governance structures should be the subject of collective bargaining contracts (Walters 1973).

Research

Empirical research on the interrelationship of faculty bargaining and campus governance is not widely known. The few reviews of this body of research (for example, Meskill and Meskill 1977; Nicholson 1977) generally have been limited in terms of coverage, currency, sophistication, or circulation.

Some caveats about this literature are in order. The reliance on perceptions and the prevalence of case studies limit the objectivity and generalizablility of the research. Perhaps the most important caveat, however, is to bear in mind the concomitant and intervening effects of contextual factors on the relationship between faculty bargaining and campus governance: (1) societal trends, such as the movement from elitism to egaliterianism, (2) the state environment, such as applicable legislation, (3) institutional characteristics, such as size and level, and (4) institutional events, such as a declaration of fiscal exigency. Some researchers have properly exercised caution in interpreting the impact of faculty bargaining on governance, pointing out the concomitant effect of other variables, including the general trend toward centralization of authority (Duryea and Neddy 1977) or a single incident, such as hiring a new university president (Sabol 1976). Others have found the interactive effects of such variables as institutional level significant (Hooper 1977). A further example of such contextual factors is the recent Supreme Court decision in *Minnesota State Board of Community Colleges V. Knight* (1984) which upheld the constitutionality of a state statute restricting, when the faculty has opted for collective bargaining, formal faculty participation in administrative policy making to the duly designated union. The result of this special statutory provision, as the Supreme Court recognized, "has been a restructuring of governance practices in [Minnesota's] community college system." Finally, some studies have found that the affiliation of the faculty bargaining organization—with the American Association of University Professors, the American Federation of Teachers, or the National Education Association—or its status as an independent organization has a measurable, albeit not predictable, effect on the general militancy of the local organization or on the specific contours of campus governance (Ladd and Lipset 1976; Napolitano 1978).

Effect of Campus Governance on Faculty Bargaining

The faculty's perceived level of involvement or influence in campus governance has generally although not consistently acted as a powerful predictor of the faculty's attitudes toward collective bargaining in higher education (Driscoll 1978; Gress 1976; Kubiak 1981; Thomas 1980). Relatively low perceptions of faculty influence tend to be associated with relatively favorable attitudes toward faculty bargaining. The inverse effect of this variable seems to carry through, although not as powerfully, in the faculty's actual voting behavior in elections (Bornheimer and Lonsdale 1979; Fitzgerald 1980). Differences between perception and actuality and between causation and correlation serve as more general qualifiers. Thus, in light of contextual and concomitant variables, the conclusion that the lack of faculty influence in institutional decision making causes their unionization receives cautious and qualified, rather than complete or consistent, support in the research to date.

Views from a legal perspective, the relationship between governance and faculty bargaining takes on an ironic twist in relation to private institutions of higher education. Most such institutions (those with gross revenues of over $1 million) have been subject to the coverage of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) since approximately 1970. In a landmark decision in 1980, the Supreme Court held that, based on their effective role in institutional governance, faculty members at Yeshiva University were managerial employees and thus excluded from coverage under the NLRA (Zirkel 1981). The National Labor Relations Board and its administrtative law judges have been busy ever since adjudicating which private institutions are like Yeshiva and thus whose faculty are not covered by the act. The results have been mixed (Lee 1983-84; National Center 1983), but, as the recent decisios in the Boston University and Polytechnic Institute of New York cases illustrate (Watkins 1984), the practical effect has been to dampen the incidence of faculty bargaining in the private sector. Thus, while the faculty's perception of their role in governance has fostered unionization, the court's perception of the faculty's governance has impeded their unionization, at least in private colleges and universities.

Effect of Faculty Bargaining on Campus Governance

National studies by Committee T of the AAUP (Pardee, Stull, and Adler 1971; Pardee, Stull, and Wolf 1969) and by the first phase of the Stanford Project on Academic Governance (Kemerer and Baldridge 1975) provide a prebargaining baseline of policies affecting governance. These studies show a general pattern in higher education of high faculty influence in academic affairs, low influence in economic matters, and mixed influence in personnel areas. Differences between two and four-year institutions account for a major variation in this pattern, however (Mortimer, Funne, and Leslie 1976).

Using the AAUP data as a baseline and identifying three subsamples of four-year institutions of higher education—unionized, "no agent" (as a result of a representation election), and "control" (that is, no such election initiated)—Adler (1977) found a slight but general increase in the level of faculty participation in institutional decision making for all three subsamples from 1970 to 1977. On a scale of 1 (no influence) to 5 (determinative influence), the overall level of the no-agent group increased 0.3, whereas the unionized and control groups' overall levels increased 0.2. These results might be attributable to a general societal shift toward participatory decision making or to a domino effect of faculty unionization on nonunionized institutions. While Adler's findings are limited by the design of his study and the sampling of only four-year institutions, studies in a variety of col

lege and university settings have found, with one exception (Hill 1982), that faculty at nonunionized institutions are equally or more satisfied with their participation in governance than those at unionized institutions (Cooper 1981; Danese 1977). And although institutional and union leaders differ with regard to the effect of faculty bargaining on the faculty's influence in campus governance, neither side views the effect as significant and both groups became less positive from 1974 to 1979 about its strength (Baldridge, Kemerer, and Associates 1981).

Similarly, one may cautiously conclude that when the overall level of faculty decision making is analyzed in terms of the previously mentioned trichotomy, faculty bargaining may have had a more widespread and marked effect on faculty influence in economic matters, particularly with regard to salaries and grievances, than in academic matters (Gilmore 1981; Kemerer, Mansel, and Baldridge 1981). In the former area, it seems relatively clear that faculty have more of a vice at unionized institutions than at nonunionized institutions with regard to the increasingly important issue of retrenchment. These contractual rights are not paticularly potent, however, particularly in the determination (as compared to the implementation) of fiscal exigency (Johnstone 1981; Lawler 1982). The level, size, and region of the institution are an important source of variation (Chandler and Julius 1980).

Studies concerning the impact of faculty bargaining on college and university senates have yielded mixed results. Some studies based solely on interviews (Hardt 1977) or contract analysis (Chandler and Julius 1980) have found no marked effects. Other, more comprehensive studies, however, reveal moderate cooptation, especially when faculty senates were weak before the onset of bargaining (Gershenfeld and Mortimer 1979; Lee 1979), and a tendency toward accommodated coexistence, particularly along the lines of a dual-track model (Kemerer and Baldridge 1981; Lee 1982). In such a model, the locus of faculty-administrator interaction in economic and personnel matters tends to gravitate toward the bargaining table, whereas academic affairs remain largely in the senate's purview. The duration of the accommodation is uncertain at this point, but the current situation is characterized by informal interaction between unions and senates and by faculty leaders' membership in both organizations (Tumminia 1979).

Faculty bargaining contracts would seem at best to have reinforced rather than extended faculty governance structures. Senates were at least partially protected in the provisions of under 15 percent of recent faculty bargaining contracts (Lee 1982). Other nonunion faculty governance structures that were by contract protected albeit by fairly small percentages, were promotion and tenure committees, curriculum committees, and academic policy committees. Two vehicles of faculty governance seldom mentioned in contracts were long-range planning and budget committees. Gains from 1970 to 1980 in contractual coverage of faculty governance were more than matched by that for management rights (Andes 1982).

As for role groups in the governance process, it appears that deans, department chair, and students have tended to lose influence and that nonteaching professionals, central administrators, trustees, and outside authorities have tended to gain power. These changes, however, are neither dramatic nor uniform, and they depend on the characteristics of the institution and the areas of decision making (Lienneman and Bullis 1980, McKeever 1978). The limited research available has found that despite the democratizing allure of unionization to junior faculty, collective bargaining seems to have left their role largely unchanged (Baldridge, Kemerer, and Associates 1981).

Conclusion

The connection between the saturated body of rhetorical writing and the neglected body of research studies about the interrelationship of faculty bargaining and campus governance has been heretofore largely lacking. Comparing and synthesizing these bodies of literature results in some tentative conclusions:

- The belief that lack of faculty influence in institutional decision making causes faculty unionization is entitled to qualified—but not complete—support. Other significant variables, such as the institutional context, enter into this equation.
- The view that faculty bargaining causes a significant increase in the faculty's influence in institutional decision making is not clearly supported, particularly for academic matters at mature universities.
- The notion that faculty bargaining will sound the death knell for faculty senates is premature at best. Thus far, the pattern seems to be one of moderate cooptation, with a tendency toward accommodated coexistence.
- The assertion that other collegial governance structures such as personnel and academic committees, will be either significantly eroded or enhanced is supported in the literature.
- To the extent that faculty have collectively gained influence in decision making, it seems that their gains have been generally paralleled by centralization of administrative authority, largely at the expense of deans and department chairs. The role of junior faculty does not seem to have changed significantly.

References

Adler, Dan L. 1977. *Governance and Collective Bargaining in Four-Year Institutions: 1970-1977.* Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service. ED 168 370. 52 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$7.24.

Andes, John. 1982. "A Decade of Development in Higher Education Collective Bargaining: Changes in Contract Content." *Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector* 11: 285-96.

Baldridge, J. Victor. January-February 1982. "Shared Governance: A Fable about the Lost Magic Kingdom." *Academe* 68: 12-15.

Baldridge, J. Victor; Kemerer, Frank R.; and Associates. 1981. *Assessing the Impact of Faculty Collective Bargaining.* AAHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 8. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education. ED 216 653. 66 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$7.24.

Birnbaum, Robert. 1980. *Creative Academic Bargaining: Managing Conflict in the Unionized Colleges and Universities.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Bornheimer, Deane G., and Lonsdale, Richard C. April 1979. "The Influence of a Group Supporting the No-Representative Position in Collective Bargainig Elections in Higher Education." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, D.C. ED 174 175. 41 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$5.49.

Boyd, William. October 1971. "Collective Bargaining in Academe: Causes and Consequences." *Liberal Education* 7: 306-18.

Brophy, Jacqueline. April 1972. "Collective Bargaining on Campus." *Today's Education* 61: 54-55.

Carey, Sheridan. January 1978. "Reasons Why Faculty Members Accept or Reject Unions in Higher Education: The University of Massachusetts Experience." *Journal of Law and Education* 7: 79-86.

Chandler, Margaret K., and Julius, Daniel J. 1980. "The Impact of Faculty Bargaining on Management's Rights." In *In Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Meeting,* edited by B. Dennis. Madison, Wisc.: Industrial Relations Research Association. *Change.* March 1977. "Three Union Leaders Talk about the Academic Future" 9: 30-35.

Cooper, Muriel. 1981. "Perceptions of Influence in Campus Decision Making: A Comparison between Nonunionized and Unionized Colleges." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Northern Colorado.

Crossland, Fred E. February 1976. "Will the Academy Survive Unionization?" *Change* 8: 38-42.

Danese, Gino, 1977. "Perceptions of Bureaucracy and Faculty Satisfaction with Participation in Decision Making at Unionized and Nonunionized Institutions of Higher Education. Ed.D. dissertation, New York University.

Dougherty, John. October 1977. "Collegiality, Governance, and Collective Bargaining in the Multicampus State University of New York." *Labor Law Journal* 28: 645-50.

Driscoll, James W. May 1978. "Attitudes of College Faculties toward Unions: Two Case Studies." *Monthly Labor Review* 101: 42-45.

Duggan, Alden, April 1980. "Collective Bargaining and University Governance." Paper presented at the annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Atlanta ED 189 960. 20 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$3.74.

Duryea, E. D., and Fisk, Robert S. 1973. *Faculty Unions and Collective Bargaining.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Duryea, E. D., and Neddy, John C. 1977. *Collective Bargaining: Impact on Governance.* Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. ED 140 772. 42 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$5.49.

Fitzgerald, Ellen. 1980. "An Analysis of Factors Influencing the Results of the Faculty Bargaining Election at the University of Minnesota, April 1978." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Garbarino, Joseph W. Spring 1980. "Faculty Unionization: The Pre-*Yeshiva* Years, 1966-1979." *Industrial Relations* 19: 221-30.

Garbarino, Joseph W., and Aussieker, Bill. 1975. *Faculty Bargaining: Change and Conflict.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gershenfeld, Walter J., and Mortimer, Kenneth P. 1979. "Faculty Collective Bargaining Activity in Pennsylvania, 1970-75." *Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector* 8: 131-49.

Getman, Julius G.; Goldberg, Stephen B.; and Herman, Jeanne. 1976. *Union Representation Elections: Law and Reality.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Gilmore, Carol B. 1981. "The Impact of Collective Bargaining on the Management of Public Higher Education Institutions." *Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector* 10: 145-52.

Gress, James R. 1976. "Predicting Faculty Attitude toward Collective Bargaining." *Research in Higher Education* 4: 247-56.

Hanley, Dexter. March 1971. "Issues and Models for Collective Bargaining in Higher Education." *Liberal Education* 51: 5-14.

Hardt, James. 1977. "Impact of Collective Bargaining on Governance in Community Colleges." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.

Hill, Malcolm D. 1982. "Variations in Job Satisfaction among Higher Education Faculty in Unionized and Nonunionized Institutions in Pennsylvania." *Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector* 11: 265-80.

Hooper, Charles. 1977 "Faculty Union Contracts and Higher Education Administration: Analysis of Faculty Union Contracts that intrude on Governance Processes of Public Higher Education Administration." Ed.D. dissertation, West Virginia University.

Ianni, Lawrence. February 1974. "The Critical State of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education." *Intellect* 102: 294-95.

Johnstone, Ronald L. 1981. *The Scope of Faculty Bargaining: An Analysis of Faculty Union Agreements at Four-Year Institutions of Higher Eduction.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

_____1981. "Senates and Unions: Unexpected Peaceful Coexistence." *Journal of Higher Education* 52: 17-25.

Kemerer, Frank R., and Baldridge, J. Victor. 1975 *Unions on Campus.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kemerer, Frank R., Mansel, R. Frank; and Baldridge, J. Victor. 1981. "The Twilight of Informal Faculty Personnel Procedures." *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 32: 17-25.

Kubiak, John 1981. "A Study of Faculty Members' Attitudes toward Collective Bargaining." Ph.D. dissertation, St. Louis University.

Ladd, Everett, and Lipset, Seymour. 17 February 1976. *"Militancy of Unionized Faculty Members." Chronicle of Higher Education:* 8. "Report of the Regents Task Force on University Governance and Collective Bargaining." Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. ED 196 353. 40 pp MF–$1.17; PC–$5.49.

Lawler, John J. August 1982. "Faculty Unionism in Higher Education: The Public Sector Experience." *Labor Law Journal* 33'; 475-82.

Lee, Barbara. 1979. "Governance at Unionized Four-Year Colleges: Effect on Decision-Making Structures." *Journal of Higher Education 50:* 565-84.

_____1982. "Contractually Protected Governance Systems of Unionized Colleges." *Review of Higher Education* 5: 69-82.

_____Spring 1983-84. "Criteria for Evaluating the Management Status of College Faculty: Applications of *Yeshiva University* by the NLRB. *Journal of College and University Law* 10: 515-40.

Lienneman, Williams, and Bullis, Bruce. 1980. *Collective Bargaining in Higher Education Systems: A Study of Four States.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities. ED 200 183. 54 pp. MF-$1.17; PC not available EDRS.

McKeever, William, 1978. "Perceptions of College Administrators, Union Representatives, and Faculty Members Regarding the Impact of Collective Bargaining on Faculty Self-Government in Hawaii." Ed.D. dissertation. University of Southern California.

Meskill, L. Drew, and Meskill, Victor P. Winter 1976. "The Effect of Collective Bargaining on the Role of the Department Chairman." *College Student Journal* 10: 380-87.

_____December 1977. "Review of Research: The Potential Impact of Collective Bargaining on the Faculty's Role in College and University Governance." *Educational Leadership* 35: 228-32.

Mortimer, Kenneth P.; Gunne, Manuel G.; and Leslie, David W. 1976. "Perceived Legitimacy of Decision Making and Academic Governance Patterns in Higher Education" *Research in Higher Education* 4: 273-90.

Napolitano, Frank. 1978. "A Study of the Perceptions of Key Administrators and Faculty of the Effects of Collective Bargaining on Governance in Institutions of Higher Education." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut.

National Center of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions. January-February 1982. "Unionization among College Faculty: 1981." *Newsletter* 10: 1-2. ED 230 141. 10 pp. MF-$1.17. PC not available EDRS.

_____July-August 1983. "Yeshivawatch—Year Four." *Newsletter* 11: 1-6. ED 235. 11 pp. MF-$1.17: PC not available EDRS.

Nicholson, Michael W. Spring 1977. "Effects of Faculty Bargaining." *Journal of the College and University Personnel Associations* 28: 38-47.

Pardee, Otway; Stull, Harris; and Adler, Dan L. 1971. "Report of the Survey Subcommittee of Committee T." *AAUP Bulletin* 7: 68-124.

Pardee, Otway: Stull, Harris; and Wolf, William. 1969. "Report of the Survey Subcommittee of Committee T." *AAUP Bulletin* 55: 180-85.

Sabol, John. 1976. "A Case Study on the Governance Function Relative to Faculty Participation at the Community College of Allegheny County from Its Beginning through Two Collective Bargaining Negotiations." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.

Shanker, Albert. 1978. *Unions and the Academic Enterprise.* Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers. ED 169 818. 14 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$3.74.

Thomas, Deborah, 1980. "Faculty Attitudes Toward Collective Bargaining in Two Selected Nonbargaining Regents Institutions in Kansas." Ph.D. dissertation, Kansas State University.

Tumminia, Philip. 1979. "An Assessment of the Impact of Collective Bargaining on Academic Governance within New Jersey Public Institutions of Higher Education." Ed.D dissertation, Temple University.

Walters, Donald E. March 1983. "Collective Bargaining in Higher Education." Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. ED 092 059. 7 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$3.74.

Wardwell, Walter, February 1979. "Unionization or Collegiality: A False Dichotomy in Higher Education." *Academe* 65: 46-48.

Watkins, Beverly. 11 July 1984. "Bargaining Rights Denied Professors at Boston University." *Chronicle of Higher Education:* 1-6.

Zirkel, Perry. April 1981· "In Search of the Meaning of Yeshiva." *AAHE Bulletin* 33: 7-10,. ED 198 788. 5 pp. MF-$1.17; PC-$3.74.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education abstracts and indexes the current literature on higher education for the National Institute of Education's monthly bibliographic journal *Resources in Education*. Most of these publications are available through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). For publications cited in this bibliography that are available from EDRS, ordering number and price are included. To order a publication, write to the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, 3900 Wheeler Dr., Alexandria, VA 22304. When ordering, specify the document number. Documents are available as noted in microfiche (MF) and paper copy (PC). Since prices are subject to change it is advisable to check the latest issue of *Resources in Education* for current cost based on the number of pages in the publication.

Administrator's Update is prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, The George Washington University, D.C. Series Editor is Glenn M. Nelson, Associate Professor of Higher Education at the University of Pittsburgh. Copies of Administrator's Update may be ordered for $2.00 each from the American Association of University Administrators, PO Box 6221, University, AL 35486. Payment must accompany all orders under $15.

This publication was prepared with funding from the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no.400-82-0011. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions of policies of NIE or the Department.

ADMINISTRATOR'S UPDATE
American Association of University
Administrators
Box 6221
University, Alabama 35486

Nonprofit Org.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
University, AL
PERMIT NO. 16